

THURSDAY, JANUARY 12, 1882.

Announcements

Athletic Park Theatre—25c matinee.
American—25c matinee.
Biden Opera House—15c matinee, 25c
Boden's Theatre—15c matinee.
Brown's Music Room—15c matinee.
Bryant's Frolics—Frolics, 25c matinee.
Crown Opera House—15c matinee.
Holiday's Alibi's Garden—Matinee, 25c.
Holiday's 10th St. Theatre—Palace, 25c.
Holiday's 5th Ave. Theatre—25c.
Milwaukee—25c matinee.
San Francisco Musical Comedy—25c matinee.
Standard Theatre—Comedy.
Theatre Francaise—The French.
Theatre Comique—Sister Sorceress.
Tony Pastor's Theatre—Variety.
Theatre Royal—The Queen of Sheba.
Union Square Theatre—Lester, London, Sultan.
Wallack's Theatre—The Queen of Sheba.
Ward's Theatre—Edna's Return.
Ward's Museum—15c matinee.

Gov. Cornell's Message.

The affairs of a State as populous, wealthy, and enterprising as that of which Gov. CORNELL is the chief functionary, ought to be administered by men of knowledge, sense, honesty, and mind. It appears by the new census that the people of the State of New York number over five millions—a population one-fifth larger than that of the kingdom of Holland or of Portugal, three-fifths larger than that of the Kingdom of Denmark or the republic of Chili, and two-thirds larger than that of the republic of Switzerland or of Peru! In fact, with the growth of the last two years the enumeration of this State is not less than \$3,500,000, which is equal to the population of the kingdom of Belgium or the khedivate of Egypt. Then, again, consider the resources, the industries, and the mercantile of our State, how large and varied they are. Why, the State of New York ought to be governed by sage and giants; and what opportunities for statesmanship they would find!

Gov. CORNELL has sent his message to the Legislature before its full organization, but he had a perfect right to do this, and it is a sort of thing that has occurred before in the State. The message is of such great length and treats of so many things that we fear there is but a small part of our busy population who will find the time to peruse it in the course of this crowded day. After referring to the general prosperity, which has reached even the working classes—by the way, let the Governor make a note, for future reference, to the effect that this community is not divided into classes in this Republican-Democratic country—the Governor takes a glance at the State finances and taxation, finding that the public revenues are more than sufficient for the public service, that the small State debt is a trifle smaller than it was last year, and that the rate of taxation, which has been lessened, can be further lessened; but the laws enacted for taxing corporations have not been enforced, and something must be done about it. The interests of the canals require attention. The volume of traffic upon the canals was largely reduced during the year, while the expenditures upon them were largely in excess of the preceding year; and the Governor holds that a constitutional amendment is required to prevent the usefulness of the canals from being seriously imperilled.

A surprising fact mentioned by the Governor is the marked decrease, during the year, in the number of children attending public schools. The falling off from the preceding year is just about ten thousand, whereas we should suppose, the growth of population ought to have enlarged the school list by at least twenty thousand. The Governor cannot account for this deplorable fact, but thinks it may have been owing to a greater demand for labor. This is a very unsatisfactory reason, and in quest for the true reason ought to be made at once by the proper authorities. Reports have been received from no less than twenty-two "literary colleges" in the State, with 4,389 students, and from 236 "academic institutions," with 31,936 pupils; and we should judge that they are nearly all in prosperity. That part of the banking business of the State operated under the provisions of the State banking laws is in a wholesome condition; and the savings-banks have enjoyed large gains in the number and amount of deposits. There has been a gratifying improvement in the transactions of the several classes of insurance companies; and the plan of cooperative insurance has become very popular, but needs to be properly guarded. The affairs of the National Guard have been of much interest to the Governor, and he believes that the scheme of reduction and reorganization will promote the efficiency of the militia.

A farm near Geneva has been chosen for the State Agricultural Experiment Station provided for last year. Scientific experiments are to be here undertaken, and the results disseminated through the State. The Governor further gratifies the farmers with the news that pleuro-pneumonia is nearly eradicated, and that, though he veiled the two geomargarine bills of the last Legislature, he is in favor of enforcing laws to prevent the sale of geomargarine as butter.

The railroad question is lightly touched. There should be fair and just regulation of freight traffic, and legislation can be secured that need not be referred to the railroads. The Governor does not refer to the question of a railroad commission, which has been so long under debate, and which will be before the Legislature once more this year. The State prisons are now self-supporting; but the figures for the charitable institutions of the State show that their expenses for the year nearly reached the enormous sum of ten millions of dollars. Most of the county jails and poorhouses are in a disgraceful condition; and the Governor bewails the growth of crime. The State Board of Health is commended for its work. The present excuse laws are inadequate, and the lawless laws are not enforced.

The affairs of this city are noticed by the Governor. We ought to be relieved from the onerous burdens fastened upon us by past legislation. Extravagant salaries should be reduced, and needless offices abolished. The people of this city need an additional water supply; and, if a new aqueduct was immediately restored, and new costs \$8,000 a year, with the expenditure of half a dozen students.

The French professor, at first employed at so much an hour, cost about \$500 a year; in 1867, \$1,750; in 1864, \$3,750; in 1872 and onward, \$4,750.

Latin and Greek originally cost \$2,000; in 1864, \$4,750; the professor receiving \$300 additional as vice-principal. In 1862 two professors were appointed at \$3,750 each; in 1867 and onward, \$4,750 each—\$9,500 a year to suppress him even now. But his mean expense for breaking his rule renders him more contemptible than ever. It proves again that he is a humbug, that his ostentatious display of wealth is a sham.

A man is a tootooter from conviction, and even if his principles compel him to deprive his guests of their customary beverages, less astute people will respect him, though they may avoid his diners. But HAYES paraded in public an abstinence he did not practice in private. More than that,

salaries and twenty tutors each at \$2,500 or less, the cost of the whole concert being \$15,000 a year.

In 1877, the Executive Committee and the Board voted \$300 out of the trust funds of the institution as a gratuity to one of the professors, on the protest that he had devoted much time to the study of literature, and in a most unusual way, and greatly to the detriment of his other interests as compared with his means still bearing a mark. If such conduct is to be rewarded, respect for law will be ruined to contempt, and the interests of the people endangered. Impressed with the vital necessity of checking this growing vice, we are now, however, and above whatever measures are deemed just and especially to promote vigor and energy among officials upon the responsibility of prosecution rates.

The Governor refers to the reapportionment of Congressional districts under the new census, to the proposed amendments of the State Constitution, and to the advantage of biennial sessions of the Legislature; he closes by reminding members of their duties, their responsibility, and their oath, and by a prayer to the Ruler of Nations.

The French Five Per Cent.

The Government of France has now for several years been paying interest at the rate of five per cent, per annum on \$1,800,000 of the national debt, out of a total of about \$4,000,000,000. It could long ago have refunded the amount at four per cent, per annum or less, and it can do so now if it chooses, but it has refrained from making the attempt, and seems likely to refrain for some time longer. It hesitates for two reasons, the one political and of long standing, the other financial and of recent origin.

The political reason for not refunding the five cents, and thereby saving the country \$1,800,000 in interest annually, is that this portion of the debt, like all the rest, is widely distributed among the voting population, and the holders of it, two millions and a half in number, would resent as a personal grievance the diminution of their incomes, which the diminution of interest would produce.

In a petition presented to the Supreme Court, and the allegations of which Mr. FIELD swore on the 22d of July, 1881, that he had reason to believe and did believe were true, we find this clause:

"VI. The net earnings of the New York Elevated Railroad Company for the last two years have been more than sufficient to pay the interest on the principal debt of at least ten per cent to its shareholders, but the net earnings of the railways of the Metropolitan Elevated Railway Company have been barely enough to pay the interest on its bonds."

To this political reason, which alone and of itself has hitherto been sufficient to deter the Government from the task, it is added that the financial reason is that given by Mr. TIDBELL, who explained that, in order to prove that it was not necessary, whether the service had been performed or not, however to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The prosecution then announced that they were proceeding to trial with regard to the charge of conspiracy to defraud the Government, by not presenting what the prosecution would prove to be worthless securities for the proper performance of contracts. The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The prosecution then announced that they were proceeding to trial with regard to the charge of conspiracy to defraud the Government, by not presenting what the prosecution would prove to be worthless securities for the proper performance of contracts. The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However, to settle that question, the Government would have to sue for damages, and a judgment of not guilty was entered by all of the defendants in this action.

The defense, however, took the position that it was a fraud, no matter whether the service had been performed or not. However